

Press-Herald

GLENN W. PFEIL

Publisher

REID L. BUNDY Managing Editor

Wednesday, October 14, 1964

A Paradox of Fortunes

Torrance is a city of more than 130,000 residents, trisected by three Assembly Districts, bisected by two Congressional Districts, and watched over by councilmen, supervisors, and commissioners almost without number.

In many respects, the city has been considered fortunate, notably by its position in Sacramento where the city has three able Assemblymen looking after its interests.

This good fortune has not spread to Washington, however, despite the fact that the city has two Congressmen purportedly representing Torrance on each side of the political aisle.

Torrance citizens, even with their two Congressmen, probably have less representation in Washington than the residents of any comparable city in the nation.

This is unfortunate because Torrance citizens, despite what you might gather from reading metropolitan-type newspapers, are really a good lot and deserve better than they get at the hands of their Congressmen.

Do you know who your Congressman is? Have you ever seen him?

Sure the 17th District's Cecil King, in Washington for more than 20 years, calls on some of his political cronies here now and then, and we assume the 28th District's Alphonzo E. Bell talks to his close friends in the Southland now and then.

And we don't expect to see any new faces on the scene as a result of November's election. After all, if Cecil King without a campaign and practically no record in Congress can beat a strong candidate like Ted Brujnsma by a handy 2-to-1 margin, he shouldn't have any trouble this year.

What we do need is more response from our Washington representatives. We believe Torrance's 130,000 residents should have a voice in Washington.

We believe Torrance residents should be heard on matters in which they have an interest.

We believe the stand our representatives take on public issues is important to Torrance residents.

We believe there should be some communication between the people and their representatives.

Is this too much to ask?

Opinions of Others

"The world's first and only nuclear-powered merchant ship, the U.S.S. Savannah, docked in New York after a 42 days' journey of 100,000 miles, having used two pounds of uranium oxide for fuel. A comparable vessel, conventionally powered, would have used an estimated two million pounds of fuel. Beseated by union jurisdictional squabbles for several years after its completion, the Savannah was tied up for many months at Galveston. It may prove to be merely an \$80 million status symbol, although it has already fulfilled all hopes."—*Norwalk (Conn.) Hour*.

"Too, we've always said a vacation was good for everyone. We used to get cocky and think, 'Well, this place just couldn't get along without me!' Then along comes vacation time, we take off on a trip, all the while worrying what's going on back on the job, and only half enjoying the vacation for fear of the chaos we were sure to find when we returned. Then, bingo, we returned only to find the business ran right on just the same. Good for a person."—*Selmer (Tenn.) Independent*.

Quote

"About the only person who is going easy with the taxpayer's money these days is the taxpayer. He has to."—Lynn Denn, Linden s(Calif.) Herald.

"There's plenty of room at the top, but there's no place to sit down."—Fred W. Grown, Bergen (N. J.) County Citizen.

"Think twice before you speak—and you'll find that your wife has changed the subject."—Harold S. May, Florence (Ala.) Herald.

My Neighbors

Are you going to vote for a man with \$171,396, when you can vote for his opponent, who has him bested by \$90,000? That's the trouble with these mindless political conventions—never gave Nelson Rockefeller a tumble, and the Governor, you'll allow, could by all four candidates.

Take Mr. Johnson's \$3.5 million—\$19 million, according to what accountant you read, and Mr. Goldwater's \$1.7 million.

HERE AND THERE by Royce Brier

Lincoln's Assets Rated Under Different System

New Yorker Magazine carried a cartoon of the banner of a senatorial candidate listing his assets and liabilities. Pretty crummy, too, with only \$18,000 in real estate, and \$321 in the bank.

True, senators are not supposed to be as rich as presidents and vice-presidents, but how poor can you get? You can get as poor as Hubert Humphrey, who is worth \$171,396. But he's still a Senator.

Take Mr. Johnson's \$3.5 million—\$19 million, according to what accountant you read, and Mr. Goldwater's \$1.7 million.

Either is pretty good moo-



Nixon Requests Johnson View on Nuclear Policy

By RICHARD M. NIXON
Most of the pollsters and political experts agree today the nuclear weapons issue may well decide the election of 1964.

It is my conviction, based on first hand personal knowledge of the decisions made on this issue during the Eisenhower Administration, that it is President Johnson's rather than Senator Goldwater's position which is dangerously reckless and irresponsible. (This state sets forth the facts as I know them and raises some crucial questions on this issue which I think President Johnson should answer.)

There are 26 NATO divisions, including six American divisions, in Europe. They face over 100 Communist divisions. Our NATO divisions would be at a terrible numerical disadvantage except for the fact that they are equipped with battlefield atomic weapons.

The Communists know this. And, the knowledge that if they launch an attack, our NATO forces, despite their numerical disadvantage, have the capability of meeting the attack with battlefield atomic weapons has kept the peace and protected the freedom of Western Europe for 10 years.

Responsibility for authorizing the use of atomic weapons rests solely with the President of the United States. There is no differ-

ence of opinion on this issue. Senator Goldwater's position, as set forth in the McElroy Task Force Report, is that the President should continue to have this sole responsibility. But, President Eisenhower recognized that in the event of a Communist attack in Europe, a delay in responding to this attack with battlefield atomic weapons, of even a few minutes, let alone hours, might result not only in losing the war but would endanger the lives of 250,000 American fighting men stationed in Europe.

He, consequently, provided that if a Communist attack occurred and the President was unable to issue the order for response with battlefield atomic weapons because of a communications breakdown, illness, or other reasons, that power under certain carefully defined circumstances could be exercised by the NATO commander. President Eisenhower had a particularly strong feeling that this procedure was wise and necessary because of his three illnesses in which there were periods when he personally would have been unable to use atomic weapons in defense against a Communist attack.

The Eisenhower policy was continued by President Kennedy. Senator Goldwater has called for a reaffirmation of the Eisenhower policy so that the time will never come when because of a communications breakdown or other

mishap our American forces in Europe would be at the mercy of a massive Communist attack and would not be able to respond with the battlefield atomic weapons without which the numerical superiority of the Communist forces is overwhelming.

President Johnson has charged that Senator Goldwater in calling for a return to the Eisenhower policy is "trigger happy and a warmonger." The people of America and particularly the 250,000 American fighting men stationed in Europe are entitled to have these questions answered by President Johnson immediately.

1. Has he revoked the Eisenhower procedure which gave the NATO commander authorization to use battlefield atomic weapons to respond to a Communist attack when a communications breakdown makes it impossible for the President to give this order?
2. If he has revoked the Eisenhower policy, what substitute procedure has he adopted, if any, to protect the security of American and other NATO forces in the event of such an attack?
3. Is it not true that the entire NATO defense concept is dependent upon the use of America's nuclear power to repulse an attack?
4. Is it not true that this NATO defense system will be gutted if the NATO commander is forbidden to react to an attack with battlefield atomic weapons unless and until the President alone, whether or not he happens to be available at the time, authorizes their use?
5. Is it not true that the whole grandiose electronic nuclear control machine President Johnson referred to on Sept. 16 in Seattle will collapse completely if the indispensable communications system should fail?
6. Is it not also true that any aggressor against the United States would strike at those communications coincident with his nuclear attack which, if successful, would consign our whole retaliatory strike into the trash heap unless someone could let our NATO commanders know that the President would like them to start shooting back?

President Johnson's silence on this issue and his continuing demagogue against Senator Goldwater's position encourages our enemies (dismays our friends, and risks the lives of 250,000 American fighting men in Europe. His conduct is dangerously irresponsible and reckless and he owes it to the American people, to our friends abroad, and to our potential enemies to clarify his position and to apologize to Senator Goldwater for distorting his position on a critical national defense issue.

AFTER HOURS by John Morley

1964 Political Oratory Moves into Home Stretch

Persuasive thunder of political oratory is now on the home stretch. We have followed it clear across the country.

It would be quite a spectacle if a reporter was not required to see the rehearsals of political by-play and some deceptive "commercials."

Major political speeches by aspirants to high office are also major productions. Several expert writers prepare such a speech, and the politician who delivers it usually has only a brief opportunity to run through it.

The speech is obviously biased. Complicated issues are usually over-simplified. The so-called debate is really no debate at all, but an able means, innuendos, real or imaginary fears, emotions, with a slight sprinkling of facts and a lot of promises, most of which could not even be realized in heaven.

The gifted politician in the use of semantics can inject flavor to tasteless issues and rejuvenate stale theories with sweet and appetizing frosting.

The listener to a political speech who really wants to be informed, rather than collect another crutch to hold up his own pet theories, cannot watch TV oratory the same as he watches "Perry Mason" or "The Defenders." For the good guys are not around to separate the fact from the fake.

The listener is required to think for himself, and this is a mean trick when political partisanship is involved. No candidate will promise war, inflation, higher taxes, unemployment, bankruptcy or be against motherhood or prosperity. Yet some offer programs, give-aways, and make promises that could create the monsters they vow to avoid. But they sound great to millions.

When a candidate suggests billions for foreign aid, he is in fact upsetting our balance of payments and U. S. gold flows out of the country. But he doesn't spell it out. When he advocates billions for aid to education, welfare, unemployment compensation, war on poverty, reducing taxes without reducing spending . . . he is giving inflation an engraved invitation to plague the economy. But he doesn't say so.

The candidate who advocates such free wheeling economic policies never tells the voters that government will be around to collect it in higher taxes. He never admits that the "brokerage fees" of the growing bureaucracy often cost as much as the programs themselves.

The more taxes are drained for federal programs, the harder for the local communities to finance their own immediate needs for schools, roads, charity, etc. But he doesn't say so.

Whatever a politician promises in the way of federal aid to any group of citizens, it is also a promise to collect the cost from other groups of citizens. This will be either paid in increased taxes, or through deficit financing, which invariably means inflation and the shrinkage of the purchasing power of everybody's dollar. But he doesn't say so.

In this campaign there is a new political sleight-of-hand proposal, called "economic growth." It is supposed to measure how much more in goods and services we produced in a given year over a previous year. This "growth" averages about 3 per cent. But the political pitchman, who favors this sleight-of-hand, only picks the good or bad years to prove his point, and fools the voters.

When the political orators use "growth" figures, the wise voter should keep in mind in what area the "growth" was acquired. Was it in excessive government deficit spending? If so, the increased taxes to pay for it dried up funds which otherwise would have been invested in new plants and machinery, which represents TRUE GROWTH.

Most popular political trick in this campaign is to

offer new jobs. The truth is that no politician creates jobs unless he loads the government payroll. No politician can eliminate unemployment. People will always be dislocated by economic conditions and loafers will always be with us.

In quoting unemployment percentages, it is well to keep in mind that they include college students on part time—wives who jump in and out of the employment market, until the unemployment compensation runs out, etc.

Beware of the politician who charges that his opponent is against "social progress." His opponent is probably very much in favor of social progress, but is opposed to the high-binding schemes that eventually will

bankrupt the economy. The candidate accused of opposing the "poverty" program is not opposed to reducing poverty. Opposition to federal aid to education does not mean opposition to educating our children. Opposition to agricultural subsidies does not mean opposition to farmers. Opposition to civil rights does not mean opposition to minorities.

What politicians often see as "national needs" are the real or imagined needs of special voting blocks. Watch for it, for in the political cliché of "looking ahead," it is wise to look behind, too, and see where the money came from for the previous expenditures for "national needs"—and how far deeper in the hole any new commitments will drive us.

Our Man Hoppe

The Fanatics For Moderation

By Arthur Hoppe

This is a strange campaign. As the experts keep pointing out, some people are going to vote for Mr. Goldwater and the rest are going to vote against him. But, sad to say, nobody's going to vote for Mr. Johnson.

This has reportedly gravely perturbed Mr. Johnson himself. And I assume he's going around saying: "How come we have all these Goldwater fanatics and we don't have any Johnson fanatics? Let's have a little fanaticism around here."

Well, I'm sure he'll be glad to hear that all this isn't quite true. And to prove it, I have at hand a dispatch from the New York Times datelined Port Moresby, New Guinea. It says: "Fifty screaming Lyndon Johnson cultists, armed with spears, clubs and stones, attacked an armed Australian administration patrol yesterday. The cultists, who would like to buy President Johnson as their leader, wounded 12 native policemen, four seriously."

Now here is true political enthusiasm, rivaling even that of a Texas chapter of the John Birch Society. And the key question, which the Times' dispatch unfortunately leaves unanswered, is what characteristic quality in Mr. Johnson has inspired such devotion in these, his followers? Why do they want to buy him?

Republicans, I'm sure, will sniffily reply: "Because he can be bought cheap." But they are speaking out of partisanship. No, I feel that somewhere Mr. Johnson must have taken a stand on an issue that touched a deep inner chord in his aboriginal supporters. And if he could just discover what it was and keep stressing it, he could have as many fanatics on his side as Mr. Goldwater.

To help, I've tried to envision the scene where it all began. As I see it, the natives must have been squatting in a circle before their huts as their chief read aloud from a brochure entitled, "All the Way with LBJ."

The Chief: Mr. Johnson's moderate Medicare bill represents a compromise between so-called socialized medicine and allowing elderly patients to fend for themselves.

The Natives (pounding their spear butts): Ai-ye! Hail the Great Compromiser!

The Chief: His middle-of-the-road position on civil rights will result in gradual assimilation of minority groups.

The Natives (waving their clubs): Long live gradualism! Hail the middle of the road!

The Chief: His cautious actions in Vietnam, avoiding either extending the war or achieving peace through neutralization, have . . .

The Natives (leaping into a savage dance): Moderation! Gradualism! Caution! Compromise! Kill, kill, kill!

No, it won't do. For if a politician wants to picture himself as a cautious, moderate, middle-of-the-road type leader, he may get elected. But he isn't going to be fanatically loved.

So I can't think of a single reason why these New Guinea natives should wish to buy Mr. Johnson. And that's too bad. Because if he could sell himself to the voters on the same basis, I'm sure they'd eat him up.

Morning Report:

I think Senator Goldwater has shown great bravery. He says if he gets elected, he'll send General Eisenhower to battle-torn, bomb-blasted South Vietnam. No, I don't mean the Senator is afraid to go himself. But he may lose Ike's vote.

You know, we veterans who have served our time get sort of resentful when we are called back for more overseas duty. We take it out on the civilians who send us.

Actually, there are probably enough generals, American and Vietnamese, over there already. I think if Senator Goldwater gets elected he should send Denison Kitchel, his general campaign manager. What Vietnam needs is a political wizard.

Abe Mellinkoff